

Published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Subscription price, \$2.00 per annum, payable strictly in advance.

In St. Louis, Canada, and in foreign countries, \$2.10.

Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103,

Act of October 3, 1917, authorized October 5, 1918.

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

Published by the

Evangelical Lutheran Synod

of

Missouri, Ohio, and Other States.

Vol. IX. — November, 1929.

**CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE,
ST. LOUIS, MO.**

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

Edited by the Faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.
Prof. W. Arndt, *Managing Editor pro tem.*, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Means of Grace	321
Dr. Luther's Warning against Sedition.....	335
The Theological Observer	341
Book Review	350

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. IX.

NOVEMBER, 1929.

No. 11.

The Means of Grace.

With Special Reference to Modernism.

By PROF. P. E. KRETZMANN, Ph. D., D. D.

(Continued.)

3.

Closely connected with the doctrine of the essence of the means of grace is that of their outward form and use. The essential difference in the viewpoint will readily appear if we remember that the Word of God (specifically the Gospel), Baptism, and the Lord's Supper are, according to Scriptural testimony, actually the bearers of God's grace; they offer, they convey, they seal, to the believer the benefit of Christ's vicarious atonement.

Some strange notions have appeared from time to time, even where there is no evidence of Modernism in the full sense of the word. Thus a recent writer says of the effect of the Reformation: "With the passage of time and the waning of the first enthusiasm the same thing happened to the Bible which had happened to the Sacrament. It became separated from the life of faith. Protestants came to think of the Bible just as the Roman Catholics had thought of the Sacrament, as something wholly mysterious and exceptional." (Brown, *Beliefs that Matter*, 216.) What he refers to is the same thing that has often been included in the accusation made against Protestants, and particularly Lutherans, that they were making the Bible a "paper pope," looking upon it in a perfectly blind and mechanical manner. It is the same charge which has been brought along similar lines when men have accused the Lutheran Church of teaching a "mechanical theory" of inspiration. But this is not the case, as well they know, and we resent and reject the insinuation as a deliberate misrepresentation. We hold what the Bible teaches, also with regard to the external form of the Bible as a means of grace.

For that reason we defend the validity of *the Gospel as a means of grace* in every form of presentation. It is true of the Gospel proclamation. The Lord tells His disciples: "Preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be

saved." Mark 16, 15, 16. And again: "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Luke 24, 47. It is true of the *written Word*. The Apostle John writes: "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that, believing, ye might have life through His name." John 20, 31. And again the same apostle writes: "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you. . . . And these things write we unto you that your joy may be full." 1 John 3, 4. The Gospel is a means of grace when spoken *in the form of the absolution from sins*, declaring that sins are forgiven. The Lord tells His disciples: "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them," John 20, 23, thereby indicating that the pronouncement of the grace of God to individuals is valid. The same is true of the Gospel as kept and moved in the heart. We are told that Mary kept all the sayings "concerning this Child" and pondered them in her heart. Luke 2, 19; cp. v. 51. And in Rom. 10, 8 we are told that the Word of faith is nigh unto us, "in thy mouth, and in thy heart," which shows that every one who ponders upon some statement of Gospel truth has in such statement the divine assurance of the forgiveness of his sins. Even a *picture* or some other *symbol* expressive of the Gospel and conveying some truth contained therein will have the power to work faith in the heart, not, of course, in any magical and mechanical way, but by virtue of the Gospel fact portrayed. Luther writes: "Thus I also believe that the good God preserved many of our forefathers in the great darkness of the Papacy. For in the midst of that great blindness and darkness so much remained that the crucifix was held before the eyes of the dying and that some laymen repeated to him, 'Look upon Jesus, who died for you on the cross.'" (Sermon on the Gospel of the 25th Sunday after Trin. XIII, 2575; cp. VIII, 183; XI, 528; XXII, 471.)

This we hold over against certain teachers who have maintained that the Gospel as a means of grace is confined to the proclamation of the Word, the Spirit being present only in this form. Quite naturally the personal element is here brought into play, as though the power of the Word depended, at least to some extent, on the person proclaiming it. However, though teachers of this type point to Rom. 10, 17 as a supposed confirmation of their position, we can freely use the arguments advanced by Gerhard: "If it is stated Rom. 10, 17: 'Faith cometh by hearing,' this is not to be understood in an exclusive sense, so that the hearing of the proclaimed Word is placed in contrast to the reading of the written

Word, but in an inclusive sense, that God effects faith and salvation not only through the Word which is heard, but also through that which is read, since it is one and the same Word, no matter whether it is preached and heard or written and read. For that reason, John fittingly says of the written evangelical history and therefore of the whole Scripture, the Old and the New Testament: 'These are written that you may believe,' John 20, 31, and: 'These things write we unto you that your joy may be full,' 1 John 1, 4. Therefore spiritual joy, and consequently also salvation, may be drawn from the written Word of God if it is but put to use by reading and meditating." (Quoted in Pieper's *Christl. Dogmatik*, III, 125 f.)

The same fact is emphasized by Luther in his exposition of 1 John 5, 13: "Lest any one deceive us, John again says against the enthusiasts that he was writing this: 'These things have I written unto you.' With them the letter is a dead thing on paper. But John says: 'I have written unto you,' since it was to serve the purpose that the letter was to be a means by which one may come to faith and eternal life. For thus says John in chapter 20 of his gospel: 'These are written that you might have faith through his name.' . . . For this reason it is necessary above all things to hear or read the Word which the Holy Ghost uses as an instrument. When one reads the Word, the Holy Ghost is there, and in this manner it is impossible to hear or read the Scripture without benefit." (IX, 1514 f.)

Another type of false teaching which sets aside the Gospel as a means of grace by disregarding its natural form is that which retains certain terms of orthodox teaching, but denies its substance. Thus we find the terms "inspiration" and "means of grace" in most books which are in any way concerned with the subject of the Bible and its teaching. If one does not examine books of this kind very closely, one is apt to think that the false enthusiasm of the last hundred years had retained at least the fundamentals of Christian faith. And we hear occasional voices even within the Lutheran Church urging us to give men of this type the benefit of the doubt, since they mean well and explain Scriptures according to their lights. But all the good intentions of Micah, Judg. 17 and 18, did not prevent him from becoming an idolater in the eyes of Jehovah, and all the prating of the false prophets about the "Word of the Lord" in the days of Jeremiah did not save them from the Lord's denunciation and punishment. This point will be taken up in detail in the next section.

Still more dangerous is a type of teaching which has been in the Church for centuries and is likewise working havoc in the field of Modernism, as we shall see. It is a movement which does not deny the validity of the Gospel as a means of grace, but at the same time invalidates this power by using other means to bring about spiritual life in the congregation. It speaks with great and glowing words of the Gospel and its life-giving message and then proceeds to insist that the way must be prepared for the Gospel-message by the natural approach, one more in keeping with the normal development of human beings. We find the influence of this type of teaching in lessons of worship on the basis of God's power in nature or in moral lessons taken from the pages of history or in deductions from the study of economics. Now, it is true that the providence of God is active in all the phenomena of nature and that it is possible to teach many a lesson from the great book which He has placed before the eyes of all men for them to study and to heed. But a contemplation of God's works cannot in itself take the place of the Gospel as a means of grace, as little as can the Natural Law in the hearts of men. No man can come to Christ and become sure of his salvation by admiring a sunset or by spending a day in "God's great out-of-doors," as the "blue domers" are in the habit of asserting. Jesus plainly states: "The *words* that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." John 6, 63. (Dangers of modern-worship program in Sunday-schools and day-schools, etc.)

This point is so important for the work of the Church to-day that we cannot refrain from quoting a few points from Pieper's *Christl. Dogmatik*, III, 157 ff. Luther knew that every "personal connection with God" which is not brought about by way of the means of grace is a dream and rests upon self-deception. We read in the Smalcald Articles: "And in those things which concern the spoken, outward Word, we must firmly hold that God grants His Spirit or grace to no one except through or with the preceding outward Word, in order that we may thus be protected against the enthusiasts, *i. e.*, spirits who boast that they have the Spirit without and before the Word and accordingly judge Scripture, or the spoken Word, and explain and stretch it at their pleasure, as Muenzer did and many still do at the present day, who wish to be acute judges between the Spirit and the letter and yet know not what they say or declare. For indeed the Papacy also is nothing but sheer enthusiasm, by which the Pope boasts that all rights exist in the shrine of his heart and whatever he decides and commands within his Church is spirit and right, even though it is above and contrary to Scripture

and the spoken Word. — All this is the old devil and old serpent, who also converted Adam and Eve into enthusiasts and led them from the outward Word of God to spiritualizing and self-conceit. . . . Just as also our enthusiasts (at the present day) condemn the outward Word, and nevertheless they themselves are not silent, but they fill the world with their pratings and writings, as though, indeed, the Spirit could not come through the writings and spoken word of the apostles, but (first) through their writings and words He must come. Why (then) do not they also omit their own sermons and writings until the Spirit Himself come to men, without their writings and before them, as they boast that He has come into them without the preaching of the Scriptures?" (*Trigl.*, 495.)

Dr. Pieper goes on, in establishing the truth of Luther's words: "The situation is this: In the kingdom of nature, God indeed is everywhere active in the world. The universe has its existence in Him. And as far as man in particular is concerned, God is the efficient cause of the natural life of all men in all zones of the earth. God gives to every one life and breath. In Him all men live and move and have their being. God also everywhere and to all men gives the goods which pertain to the natural life. He gives to all men rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling their hearts with food and gladness. *But the forgiveness of sins for Christ's sake and faith in the forgiveness of sins*, the regeneration to spiritual life, and all the spiritual treasures therewith connected God gives to men *only* through the means of grace ordained by Him, through the Word of the Gospel and the Sacraments. . . . Therefore everything that men regard as a working of the Holy Spirit without the Word and outside of the Word is a *non-ens*, imagined and self-made. What one has or imagines to have without the means of grace is not the product of the Holy Spirit, but that of man, 'man-made.'"

With regard to the outward form of the Word of God, the Gospel, as a means of grace, we must finally remember that *sermons* are included in the category, inasmuch as and in so far as they are actually based upon the Word of God and offer the truth of the Gospel. This does not mean that a sermon must consist merely of quotations from the Bible; for such a procedure might under circumstances be very ineffective. But the man who speaks or teaches in the name of Jesus, as a minister or teacher of the Church, should speak as the oracles of God, 1 Pet. 4, 11, proclaiming nothing that is not in full harmony with the revealed Truth. The same is true of *hymns and prayers* used anywhere in the Church. They

are the bearers of the grace and the Spirit of God in the measure in which they present the Word of God, teach the great truths of salvation. The sects have effectual preaching and singing in the measure in which they proclaim Lutheran doctrine, that is, pure Bible truth. A Presbyterian preacher will save no one by his peculiar Calvinistic doctrine of predestination; a Baptist will bring no one into heaven by his strange teaching of the necessity of immersion; a Methodist will not be a guide to eternal bliss while he prates about perfect sanctification. But all three, and others as well, will be true ministers of Christ if they teach justification by faith alone, if they consistently set forth the vicarious atonement of Christ and the propitiation through His blood. (Danger of unionism; poison in water.)

But just as we reject all errors with regard to the outward form of the Gospel as a means of grace and warn every one against the danger of false enthusiasm, so we consistently uphold the form of the Sacraments against every encroachment of falsehood. We are conscious, during every step of the way, that the doctrine of the means of grace is fundamental and that the highest form of Christian liberty is that which moves within the scope of God's revelation. Our confession states (Apology, Art. XIII: Of the Number and Use of the Sacraments; *Trigl.*, 309): "Just as the Word enters the ear in order to strike our heart, so the rite itself strikes the eye in order to move the heart. The effect of the Word and of the rite is the same, as it has been well said by Augustine that a Sacrament is a visible word, because the rite is received by the eyes and is, as it were, a picture of the Word, signifying the same thing as the Word. Therefore the effect of both is the same."

With regard to the *outward form and practise of Baptism* we have particularly two strange notions to contend with, as has been the case for four centuries. We have those who deny the validity of child baptism as it has certainly been practised in the Christian Church since the second century and, by inference, since the time of the apostles. But what objections are brought forward against the baptism of infants? It is said that we have no command in Scriptures to baptize children. But have we a direct command to baptize women? Have we a direct command to baptize young people? Christ says: "Baptize all nations." Matt. 28, 19. If nations include women and young people, they surely include children as well; for where else shall we place the children? — The objection is made that children cannot believe, and Baptism requires faith. But we challenge the statement. In Matt. 18, 6 Jesus says of the little

ones, the little children of whom the Lord placed a sample before His disciples for greater emphasis, that they believe in Him. And of Timothy, Paul states that he knew the way to salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus since the time when he was an infant in arms. 2 Tim. 3, 15.

Another objection, made chiefly by the Baptists and the Campbellites, is this, that the only form of baptism which is valid is that by immersion, and they have made this point a divisive feature from the time of the establishment of their denominations. But the Bible clearly shows that the word here concerned means every form of application of water. Mark 7, 4; Luke 11, 38. (Cp. Walther, *Pastorale*, 115 f.)

In this connection it is necessary also to call attention to the strange statements concerning the use of the baptismal formula. A great many people have been filled with anxiety because the words of institution speak of baptizing "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," while we are told that in apostolic times certain people were baptized "in the name of Jesus." But the situation is simply this: While the apostles baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, they, by that token, baptized in the name of Jesus, and in reliance upon His redemption. As for us, we use the words of Christ's institution and do not experiment.

This is also our position with regard to *the Lord's Supper*. Instead of joining the bold spirits of all times who experimented with the elements of the Eucharist by using all kinds of substitutes, we use bread and wine, thereby avoiding all possibilities of mistakes, especially since we have no authority to bring an element of doubt into the Sacrament. (Cp. Pieper, *l. c.*, III, 413.) We likewise refuse to join those who would connect certain physical effects with the bodily eating and drinking in the Sacrament. A favorite expression of such teachers is that which speaks of the "planting of the resurrection body." This would then have to be regarded as a mechanical or magical effect, without any basis in the Word of God. Over against such speculations we hold: "As certain as it is that Christ in the Lord's Supper gives us not merely symbols of His body and blood, but the body and blood itself, so certain it also is that He names as the purpose of this miraculous gift, not any particular physical effect, but only the assurance and testimony that God, for the sake of the body which was given and the blood which was shed, is gracious to those who eat and drink as believers."

4.

Our chief objection to Modernism is that it clothes the doctrine of the devil in the livery of an angel of light. It is far easier to fight falsehood if it openly proclaims itself as such than when it assumes the label of a higher revelation of truth. For that reason the doctrine of the means of grace as found in Scripture was set forth with some attention to detail and as opposed to errors of various kinds. On the basis of what was said in the earlier part of this essay we are bound to conclude that it is the function of the means of grace to transfer and to bestow the objective justification by and through faith and thus to produce spiritual life in the hearts of men.

Even with regard to this plain and Scriptural definition of the means of grace we find that Modernists have left the sound truth of the Bible and substituted one of emotional appeal. A means of grace, in the opinion of the Modernist, is something by which he lifts himself to the level of the divine, by which he is filled with Christlike qualities. The grace of which he speaks is a quality in himself, which is simply suggested and nourished by constant contact with the historical Christ. But according to the Bible the significance of a means of grace consists in this, that the redemption wrought by Christ is brought to the attention of sinful human beings, who by their own reason and strength cannot believe in Jesus Christ or come to Him, so that the faith wrought by this message may apprehend the fact of the vicarious atonement and put its trust in the salvation offered in and by the Word. Of course, there will follow a subjective certainty on the part of the believer; in fact, one of the strongest evidences for the truth of Scriptures, to a believer, is that quiet certainty brought into his heart by the Gospel-message. But this is a consequence of the act of God in working faith; it does not exist apart from the objective revelation contained in the Gospel. It can never precede the teaching of the actual Gospel-message.

A careful study of Modernist literature quickly shows that all the men affiliated with that movement reject the objective fact of the divine origin of the Bible in the sense of its being inspired or God-breathed and therefore inerrant. J. F. Clarke writes in his book *Common Sense in Religion*: "The curious fact in regard to this theory of verbal inspiration is that the Bible itself makes no such claim. . . . Inspiration means the descent of some higher truth into the soul by vital processes, not merely logical or

mechanical." (Pp. 87. 90.) To all Modernists, inspiration is merely a form of glorified excitement or enthusiasm, such as may well be felt by any person under the stress of some powerful emotion. If this culminates in some sort of religious expression, then it is declared to be divine. In G. B. Smith's *Social Idealism and the Changing Theology* we find the following passage: "No longer do we feel it necessary to insist on the complete passivity of the human writers of the Biblical books [this being a nasty lunge at the so-called mechanical inspiration of the Bible], so that it may be possible to assert that the Bible has a totally different origin from other writings. More and more we are seeking to bring the Biblical writers within the circle of normal human experience and to picture them as subject to the same fears and hopes as other men of their day. . . . The Bible is valued to-day because of its actual power to quicken our religious and moral ideals rather than because of any particular theory concerning its origin." (P. 217.) Another author of the same type, William De Witt Hyde, in his book *Social Theology*, has a most enthusiastic section on inspiration, in which he constantly uses the phraseology of orthodox belief in the Gospel as a means of grace. But instead of finding a clear and unequivocal statement that the Bible is the Word of God, verbally inspired, we find the passage: "Reverent appreciation of the Bible as our ultimate literary expression of the life of the Spirit does not compel one to accept blindly, or to interpret literally, every narrative or statement it contains. Here, as in all ancient history and literature, criticism has a great sifting process to perform. And the more searching and thoroughly this is done, the more valuable and reliable will the book become." (P. 192.) After we human beings, then, with our finite and inadequate minds, have put the Bible through a sifting process, eliminating what does not suit our enlightened reason, we may accept what one has sarcastically called "the remains."

If the objection should here be raised that the quotations made till now are from books which are more than ten years old and that the exponents of Modernism have since returned to their right senses, we shall quote from books of leaders of Modernism, all of which have appeared since 1923, one of them bearing the date 1928. Nolan R. Best, editor of the *Continent*, a Liberal Presbyterian, has written a book on *Inspiration*, in which chapter VIII treats of "The Mirage of Inerrancy." In this chapter he writes: "The power of the Bible, its worth, its right to speak to human souls, its conveyance of the message from God, do not depend on inerrancy and

are not vacated when the student of the Scriptures abandons the effort to show that the Bible is a book of no mistakes." (P. 69.) And again: "If God had ever intended to stake the reputation or the authority of the Bible on a superhuman accuracy in minor and incidental facts, He would certainly have taken care to make that extraordinary exactness an unmistakable phenomenon. There is no evidential value for inspiration to be drawn from the sort of inerrancy which to a cursory reader is so little manifest that he thinks he sees quite the opposite — the same kind of harmless inexactitude that he would expect in all story-telling and history-writing by average honest men." (P. 77.) Note the phrase "he thinks he sees," which is very characteristic of Modernism. They are invariably long on thinking, or rather, on speculating, but proportionately short on knowing.

One of the foremost Modernists is Harry Emerson Fosdick, Professor of Practical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York, whose book *The Modern Use of the Bible* first appeared in 1924. We quote from the reprint of July, 1927. In the first lecture, entitled "The New Approach to the Bible," we find the following passage: "We used to think that God created the world by fiat on the instant [!], and then, learning that the world evolves, many were tempted to cry out that God did not create it at all. We now know that changing one's idea of a process does not in itself alter one's philosophy of origins. So we used to think of inspiration as a procedure which produced a book guaranteed in all its parts against error and containing from beginning to end a unanimous system of truth. No well-instructed mind, I think, can hold that now. [?] Our idea of the nature of the process has changed. . . . Our ideas of the method of inspiration have changed; verbal dictation, inerrant manuscripts, uniformity of doctrine between 1000 B. C. and 70 A. D. — all such ideas have become incredible in the face of facts." (P. 30 f.) Again, in the lecture on "Miracle and Law" the author says: "Folk who insist on that kind of literal inerrancy in ancient documents are not Fundamentalists at all; they are incidentalists. Joshua making the sun stand still may be poetry, and the story of Jonah and the great fish may be parable; the miraculous aspects of the plagues in Egypt and the magic fall of Jericho's walls may be legendary heightenings of historical events; the amazing tales of Elijah and Elisha may be largely folk-lore; and, in the New Testament, finding a coin in a fish's mouth to pay the Temple tax or walking on water or blasting a tree with a curse, may be just such stories as always have

been associated with an era of outstanding personalities and creative spiritual power. Certainly I find some of the miracle-narratives of Scripture historically incredible." (P. 163 f.) The last statement is at least frank and unmistakable, showing us exactly with what kind of a person we are here dealing. The same author criticizes the very idea of desiring an infallible and inerrant guide. In the lecture on "Jesus the Messiah" he says: "Men who are in earnest about doing the will of God must know what that will is, and they want a book to tell them in definitive terms. When, therefore, the New Testament was added to the Old and the whole book was bound up into unity by a theory of inerrant inspiration, Christians used the whole book as the Jews had used part of it; it was the divine oracle to tell men how to live. . . . This has been one of the major uses of Scripture in Christian history. Ecclesiastical bodies, from the Roman Church citing a text for its justification to Protestant communities claiming the support of Scripture for their diverse politics and practises, have employed the Bible as though it were a book of canon law to define the procedure and organization of Christian churches forever." (P. 237.) And the man who makes these ambiguous and misleading statements is a professor of theology!

However, a colleague of his, William Adams Brown, in the year of our Lord 1928, has published a book entitled *Beliefs that Matter*, in which chapter VIII deals with the question "Why We Need the Bible." This man has the following to say on the Bible: "Men long for a final and authoritative revelation, a revelation which will relieve them of all responsibility and will put the whole weight upon God alone; and such a final and authoritative revelation the inerrant Bible seemed to give. But in fact the Bible has not proved to be a book of this kind. The proof of this is not that the scholars find errors in the Bible. It is always possible for an ingenious commentator to explain these errors away. The convincing proof is that the Bible has not done what an infallible book is expected to do. It has not given its message in such a clear and unmistakable form that all Christians have agreed as to its meaning. Scholars who have studied the original text have understood the book differently from readers who have only the English translation. And recourse to the original text has not secured agreement among the scholars. Catholic scholars have differed from Protestant, and Protestants have differed among themselves. The claim of an inerrant book has not united Christians; it has divided them." (P. 217.) Over against the abysmal ignorance dis-

played in some of these statements it is sufficient to place 2 Cor. 2, 16; 3, 14; 4, 3, 4; 2 Pet. 3, 16. The more a person reads in the book of Dr. Brown, the more he is amazed at the lack of information concerning the contents of the Book displayed by the author.

Both of these men, and a host of Modernists with them, speak of an inspiration, but they refuse to accept the inspiration which God Himself teaches and which the holy writers claim for themselves. They thus set aside the certainty of the power of God in the Word and thereby the objective and absolute value of the Gospel as a means of grace. Well has Haldeman, in his review of Fosdick's Book, stated the belief of the author in the following form: "A Bible contradicted by science, unreliable in history, not always moral, and whose shifting thought-forms, whose uncertain 'framework,' make it of avail only as it can be proven by personal experience." (P. 71.) And one is inclined to subscribe most heartily the words of Leander S. Keyser, in his book *The Doctrines of Modernism*, in which he describes the position of Fosdick as follows: "Only those parts of the Bible are to be accepted which tally with man's present 'experience.' There are many things in the Bible which we cannot experience; these we may cast aside as 'outmoded categories' and may still be good Christians if we have had the aforesaid 'experience.' Only the things that the 'modern man' can experience are the 'abiding' realities; all the rest is temporary scaffolding, to be torn down and thrown into the scrap-heap — except, of course, that it must be preserved to show us what 'progress' we have made since Bible times. For each individual it is not the Bible, but 'experience' which is the ultimate authority in religion. . . . When they can throw overboard whatever does not suit them in the Bible and accept only what their proud reason approves, they will naturally think that what they leave of the Bible makes a great book! Is it not the verdict of their own wisdom?" (Pp. 11. 36.)

But if the Modernists do not hesitate to lay blasphemous hands on the Bible itself, denying its inspiration and infallibility and thereby declaring the idea of the Gospel's being a true means of grace an absurdity, we can hardly expect them to leave the Sacraments unattacked. They blandly use the old terms, the traditional orthodox terminology, but they have managed to extract all the worth and power from the Sacraments, leaving nothing but empty husks. This was to be expected, of course, since Modernism grew on the soil of rationalism and Calvinism, and in both cases, reason has been a determining factor in accepting doctrines or in rejecting

them. Therefore we find S. S. Schmucker making concessions, in *An Elementary Course of Biblical Theology*, to reason and false enthusiasm when he says of the Lord's Supper: "That the bread and wine remain in all respects unchanged; that the glorified human nature of Christ is not substantially (essentially) present at all, but only influentially, efficaciously, or virtually, that is, by a special supernatural influence, exerted on all communicants at the time when they receive the bread and wine." It is hard to say from this passage whether Schmucker believed in the real presence; he certainly did not believe in the sacramental union in the Lord's Supper. But his vague and uncertain explanations are mild in comparison with those of the men who have taken God's grace out of both Sacraments and have given them a merely subjective character.

Thus Brown writes, in the book referred to above, with regard to the Sacraments, particularly Holy Baptism: "This element of commitment appears most clearly in connection with the Sacrament of Baptism, . . . a commitment so unreserved that any conscious sin imperiled the status of the new convert. . . . In the case of infants, who cannot exercise faith for themselves, the act of consecration which gives the Sacrament its spiritual meaning is performed by their parents. . . . The self-commitment implicit in Baptism and publicly recognized in confirmation is repeated in connection with the Lord's Supper. . . . We respond to God's gift in the Sacrament first of all by thanksgiving, or, in other words, by grateful appreciation of what He is and what He has done. . . . Our gratitude expresses itself in our conduct toward our fellow-men and especially in loving ministry to those who are in need." (P. 261 f.) All of which would have some significance if there were some plain statement regarding sin and grace, that is, sinful man coming to God with the prayer for forgiveness and receiving the assurance of the redemption through the body and blood given and shed for him for the forgiveness of sins. But sin and remission of sin is not associated in the minds of the Modernists. To them the sacramental act which makes the Sacrament a means of grace, by which the proclamation of the redemption is made, has no significance. The Sacrament, either Baptism or the Eucharist, is simply a commitment, a rite of consecration, by which man pledges himself to God, not an act by which, chiefly and essentially, God bestows blessings upon men.

The same error is found in other writings of prominent Modernists. Hyde is anxious to retain all the orthodox expressions,

and yet his presentation is woefully inadequate, since he does not recognize the divine or supernatural element in the Sacraments. He writes: "As Baptism marks the renunciation of self and the world as the determining principles of conduct, the Lord's Supper is the symbol of communion with Christ and His followers as the inspiration of the new life. There is nothing magical or miraculous about this most simple and natural of rites. Christ is present in the elements just as the writer of a letter is present in the writing. The reading of the letter is the reception of the writer's mind and heart. We receive Christ in the bread and wine as we receive a friend when we clasp his hand. . . . Jesus, in instituting the Lord's Supper, has simply made universal the communication of His sacrificial love. He has made the bread and wine forever, and to all who receive it, the symbol and expression of the life He lived and the death He suffered in love to all mankind. Translated by the intelligent and devout recipient into terms of the love and sacrifice it is intended to express, it becomes the bread of life and the wine of love to as many as receive it in this faith." (*L. c.*, 194 f.) And Smith writes: "If Baptism actually makes men conscious of the redeeming power of God, if it actually serves to deepen in the consciousness of the Christian the assurance of God's presence, its right in Christianity is sufficiently vindicated. . . . It is frequently urged that one of the chief benefits of the Eucharist is so to impress the soul with the presence of God in this particular instance that under the inspiration thus gained one may learn to discern the divine presence everywhere." (*L. c.*, 215 f.) This is a typical example of the empty words which the Modernists employ in order to invalidate the Sacraments as means of grace. This will be seen also from a final quotation, taken from Rauschenbusch's *A Theology for the Social Gospel*: "We could imagine a minister and a group of candidates who unite in feeling the evil of the present world order and the promise and claims of the impending Christian world order together using Baptism to express their solemn dedication to the tasks of the kingdom of God and accepting their rights as children of God within that kingdom. . . . In the Lord's Supper we reaffirm our supreme allegiance to our Lord, who taught us to know God as our common Father and to realize that all men are our brethren. In the midst of a world full of divisive selfishness we thereby accept brotherhood as the ruling principle of our life and undertake to put it into practise in our private and public activities. We abjure the selfish use of power and wealth for the exploitation of our fellows. We dedicate our lives

to establishing the kingdom of God and to winning mankind to its laws." (Pp. 200. 206.) Rauschenbusch, like all exponents of the social theology and all his Modernist brethren, has not the faintest conception of the heavenly character of the Sacraments and of the gifts of God's grace offered and sealed to the believers thereby. How different the simple and powerful explanation in Luther's Catechism: "Baptism is not simple water only, but it is the water comprehended in God's command and connected with God's word. . . . It works forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and gives eternal salvation to all who believe this. . . . It [the Lord's Supper] is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the bread and wine, for us Christians to eat and to drink, instituted by Christ Himself"! May God in His mercy preserve us from the destructive powers of Modernism, especially in its denial of the means of grace! (*To be concluded.*)

Dr. Luther's Warning against Sedition.

(*Concluded.*)

17. If you, however, say, What, then, are we to do if the government is not minded to take the initiative? Shall we tolerate it still longer and strengthen their insolent effrontery? Answer: No, you should do nothing of the kind. Three things you should do regarding this situation. First: You should realize your transgression, which God's stern righteousness has visited upon you by means of such antichristian reign, as St. Paul declares, 2 Thess. 2, 11. 12: "God shall send them strong delusion and rule, because they received not the love of truth that they might be saved." We alone are to blame for everything that the Pope and his followers perpetrated upon our property, our bodies, and our souls. Therefore you must first confess your sin and put it off before you would get rid of the punishment and plague; otherwise you will kick against the pricks, and the stone which you are casting upward will fall upon your head.

18. Secondly: You must humbly pray against the papal rule, as Ps. 10 does and teaches, saying vv. 12ff: "Arise, O Lord; O God, lift up Thine hand; forget not the humble. Wherefore doth the wicked contemn God? He hath said in his heart, Thou wilt not require it. Thou hast seen it; for Thou beholdest mischief and spite to requite it with Thy hand. The poor committeth himself unto Thee; Thou art the Helper of the fatherless. Break Thou the arm of the wicked and the evil man; seek out his wickedness till Thou find none," etc.

19. Thirdly: Suffer your mouth to be a mouth of the spirit of Christ, of whom St. Paul says above, 2 Thess. 2, 8: "Our Lord Jesus shall consume him with the spirit of His mouth." This we do if we boldly continue as we have begun, orally and in writing driving home to the people the Pope's and the papists' knavery and deception, until he, openly exposed the world over, is detected and put to shame. For one must first consume him with words; the mouth of Christ must do it. Thus he will be forced from the hearts of men and his lies exposed and despised. Moreover, when he has been removed from the heart, so that his claims are no longer respected, then he is already destroyed. In this way we can give him blows more telling than with a hundred riots. By violence we shall deprive him of nothing, yea, rather strengthen him, as has been the experience of many. But with the light of the truth, if one contrasts him with Christ and his doctrine with the Gospel, then he falls and is undone without any toil and moil. Witness my record: Have I not wrested from the Pope, the bishops, priests, and monks by mere words, without a stroke of the sword, more than all emperors and kings and princes have wrested from him in the past with all their power? Why? Because Daniel, chap. 8, 25, declares: "This king shall be broken without hand," and St. Paul, 2 Thess. 2, 8: "He shall be consumed by the mouth of Christ." Now I and every one who speaks Christ's Word can freely boast that his mouth is the mouth of Christ. I am positively certain that my word is not my own, but Christ's Word; accordingly, my mouth also must be His whose Word it speaks.

20. Therefore you should not desire a physical riot. Christ Himself has already begun one with His mouth, which will be altogether too severe for the Pope; let us follow and continue in it. What is now in progress in the world is not our work. It is not possible that a mere man should begin and carry forward such a movement independently. It has also progressed thus far without my deliberation and counsel; moreover, without my counsel it shall succeed, and the gates of hell shall not hinder it. Another man is at the wheel; Him the papists do not see and so blame us; but they shall assuredly realize it. The devil has trembled long before these years and has smelled a rat from afar, has also published many prophecies against it, some of which point to me, so that I am often astonished at his great craftiness. Many a time he would only too gladly have killed me. At present he would be delighted to have a physical riot develop, so that this spiritual riot might be confounded and prevented. But, God willing, it will not and shall

not help him. "Without hand and by the mouth only shall he be broken"; nothing can prevent this.

21. See, then, that you further, and assist in furthering, the cause of the Gospel; teach, speak, write, and preach that human laws avail nothing; restrain and advise that no one become a priest, monk, or nun and that whoever has entered the order may walk out; give no more money for bulls, candles, bells, tablets, churches, but declare that a Christian life consists in faith and love; and let us continue this two years more, and you will then see where Pope, bishops, cardinals, priest, monk, nun, bells, tower, mass, vigils, cossacks, cowls, pates, rule, statutes, and all the trappings and trumpery of papal power will remain; it will all vanish like smoke.

22. But if we do not teach this nor spread such truth among the people, so that such stuff may be torn out of their hearts, then the Pope will likely remain with us, even though we begin a thousand riots against him. Behold what has been accomplished in this one year, since we have advanced and written such truth! How the cover has become too short and narrow for the papists. The stationaries complain that they must simply die of starvation. What will happen if this mouth of Christ will thresh with His spirit for two more years? Such play the devil would fain hinder by physical riot. But let us be wise, thank God for His holy Word, and cheerfully offer our mouths for this blessed riot.

23. Exposed is the papists' ignorance; exposed is their hypocrisy; exposed is their false lying in their laws and orders; exposed is their false tyranny of the ban. In short, exposed is everything wherewith they have hitherto bewitched, terrorized, and seduced the world. One sees that it has been nothing but jugglery. There remains nothing more about them to be feared than only a little prop of secular power. But because the luster is gone and they must protect themselves exclusively by force, it is not possible that they can exist for any length of time. And what the mouth of Christ spares, that "His coming shall destroy," as St. Paul says, 2 Thess. 2, 8. Therefore let us cheerfully continue, faithfully driving home the Word, driving out the man-made laws; thus Christ is slaying the Papacy through us. It is already singing, "Eli, Eli"; it has been stricken. Soon we will hear, *Expiravit*, that is, it gave up its ghost.

24. But in this campaign I must again admonish some for inflicting a great defection and defamation upon the holy Gospel. There are several who, when they have read a page or two or heard a sermon, immediately launch forth and do nothing more than

override and condemn them with their activity as not being evangelical, regardless of the fact that there are at times plain, simple-minded folk who would readily learn the truth if it were told them. This also I have taught no one, and St. Paul has strictly forbidden it. They do it only because they wish to know something novel and be considered genuinely Lutheran. But they wantonly abuse the holy Gospel. By such a procedure you will never drive the Gospel into the hearts; you will rather deter them, and you will have to render a grave account for having thus driven them away from the truth.

25. Not so, thou fool. Listen and let me tell you: First I pray you to desist from using my name and not to call yourself Lutheran, but Christian. What is Luther? For the doctrine is not mine, nor have I been crucified for any one. St. Paul, 1 Cor. 3, 4. 5, would not suffer the Christians to call themselves Pauline or Petrine, but Christians. How can I, poor, corruptible mortal that I am, permit that the children of Christ should be called by my worthless name? Not so, dear friends; let us banish partisan names and be called Christians, whose doctrine we have. It is quite proper for the papists to have a partisan name. Because they are not content with Christ's doctrine and name, they wish to be papal also; so let them be papal because the Pope is their master. I am not, and do not want to be, any one's master. In agreement with the Church I confess the one common doctrine of Christ, who alone is our Master. Matt. 23, 8.

26. Secondly: If you wish to use the Gospel in a Christian manner, you must regard the person with whom you are speaking. There are two classes. In the first place, some are hardened in heart, who will not hear and, in addition, seduce and poison others with their lying mouths, such as the Pope, Eck, Emser, some of our bishops, priests, and monks. With these you should not deal at all, but act in accordance with the declaration of Christ, Matt. 7, 6: "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet and turn again and rend you." Let them remain dogs and swine; at all events, love's labor is lost with them. Sirach, too, says, chap. 32, 6: "Where there is no hearing, pour not out words." But if you see that these liars are also pouring their lies and poison into other people, then you should boldly oppose them and contend against them, even as Paul opposed Elymas with hard, sharp words, Acts 13, 10. 11, and as Christ called the Pharisees a generation of vipers, Matt. 23, 33. This you should not do for their sakes,—

for they heed it not, — but for the benefit of those whom they poison. Thus St. Paul commands Titus, chap. 1, 10, 11, to rebuke sharply such vain talkers and deceivers of souls.

27. In the second place, there are some who have previously not heard more about this and would surely learn if they would be informed; or they are too weak easily to grasp it. These should not be bullied and browbeaten, but be taught kindly and gently and shown the why and wherefore, and if they cannot comprehend it immediately, be patient with them for a while. Of this Paul speaks Rom. 14, 1: "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye." Likewise St. Peter, in his first epistle, chap. 3, 15: "Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear." Here you see that we should give instruction in regard to our faith with gentleness and fear of God if some one desires it or stands in need of it.

28. If you merely wish to display your great skill before these people, suddenly sallying forth and claiming that they do not pray properly, fast, and observe the Mass, and you mean to eat meat, eggs, and what not on Friday, without, however, stating the reason for this with meekness and fear, then such a simple heart cannot but consider you a proud, impudent, and perverse person, which in fact you are, and he concludes that one should not pray and do no good, that the Mass is nothing, and so forth. Such error and offense you have caused, and you are to blame. And so it happens that they misjudge and speak ill of the holy Gospel and think that you have been taught atrocious things. Of what benefit to you, then, is that you have given offense to your neighbor and are hindering the Gospel? You have indulged your wantonness. And they will say, Oh, I will abide in my faith, and close their hearts against the divine truth.

29. If you would, however, with fear and meekness, as St. Peter teaches, show the reason for your belief and action and say: Dear man, fasting, eating eggs, meat, and fish is a matter upon which salvation does not depend, it may be done for better or for worse, or omitted, faith alone saves, etc., whatever should be said here; likewise, the Mass might be good if it were observed properly, etc., — then they would come and hear and ultimately learn what you know. But now that you are so impudent, exalting yourself because you know something they do not know, acting like the Pharisee in the Gospel, Luke 18, 11, and permitting their ignorance of what you know to be the cause of your arrogance, you are subject to the judgment of St. Paul, Rom. 14, 15: "*Jam non secundum caritatem*

ambulas," "Thou walkest not charitably"; you despise your neighbor, whom you ought to serve with fear and meekness.

30. Let me give you an illustration. If an enemy of your brother had tied a rope around the neck of your brother, so that he would be in danger of being strangled, and you fool would become incensed over the rope and the enemy, and, running up to him, would vehemently pull the rope toward you, or would stab at it with a knife, you would surely strangle your brother or stab him and do more harm than the rope and the enemy. On the contrary, if you want to help him, you must act in this manner: You may punish or beat the enemy as severely as you please; but the rope you must handle gently and with fear until you have removed it from his neck, lest you strangle your brother.

31. In like manner you may attack the liars, the hardened tyrants, severely and act contrary to their doctrine and work, for they will not hear. The simple-hearted, however, who are dangerously bound by them with the cords of such doctrine, you must treat differently altogether; with fear and meekness you must loose man-made doctrine, give argument and reason, and thus in time set them free also. That is what St. Paul did when, in defiance of all the Jews, he would not have Titus be circumcised, Gal. 2, 3, and yet circumcised Timothy. Behold, even so you must treat the dogs and swine differently from men and the wolves and lions differently from the weak sheep. With the wolves you cannot be too severe; with the weak sheep you cannot be too gentle. We certainly must at this time conduct ourselves not otherwise than as if we lived among the heathen, because we live among the papists; aye, they are easily sevenfold heathen. Therefore we should, as St. Peter teaches, 1 Pet. 2, 12, "have our conversation honest among the Gentiles that they may not truthfully speak against us as evil-doers," as they would be delighted to do. They very much delight in hearing you glory in this doctrine and yet are offensive to such as are weak, so that they may decry the entire doctrine as offensive and harmful; for by any other method they cannot detract from it and must confess that it is true.

32. *God grant unto us all that we may live as we teach*, that we translate our words into deeds. There are many among us who say, 'Lord, Lord,' and praise the doctrine, but the deed, the obedience, is not forthcoming. Let this suffice for the present as a renewed admonition to beware of riot and offense lest the holy Word of God be profaned by us. Amen.

January 19, 1522.

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Neutralia.—The resolutions adopted by the Lutheran World Convention at Copenhagen declare: "The discovery and furtherance of inner unity in the truth in loyalty to the confessional principle therefore is a primary object." With this object in view "this book [*The Lutheran Churches of the World*] was compiled at the request of the Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Convention and must be regarded as a product of that movement." (Foreword.) The president of the executive committee, Dr. John A. Morehead, states in the preface: "... the first book endeavoring to give a well-balanced description of the confessional position, organization, worship, numerical strength, missionary activity, and general status of the Lutheran churches throughout the world. It is confidently believed that it will prove to be an important contribution to Lutheran unity." Now, while the gathering of this immense material on the state and the work of the Lutheran Church serves a good purpose and will prove of interest to every Lutheran, it does not serve the purpose for which it was performed. As regards the furtherance of Lutheran unity it is a dealing with *neutralia*. Luther uses this phrase in an opinion given to Chancellor Brueck on the religious concord advocated by Philip of Hesse and Martin Bucer. We are here giving the phrase a somewhat different slant. Luther writes: "My dear Doctor, I am telling you, as in the presence of my gracious lord, that the course of the landgrave and his men is quite vexatious in that they invert the Lord's Prayer by seeking first of all quiet and peace and not studying the first things, God's name, kingdom, and will. What is that saying about straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel? If one is seeking concord in religion, let him begin with the fundamentals, such as doctrine and Sacrament; when these things are agreed on, the other things, the externals, which are called *neutralia*, will adjust themselves, as happened in our churches; then God would be in the *concordia* and quiet and peace assured. But where the great matters are passed over and the *neutralia* dealt with, God is being forgotten; a peace without God may ensue, in place of which one should rather suffer all unquietness. For what Christ says Matt. 9 will certainly take place: The piece of new cloth on the old garment will make the rent worse, and the new wine breaks the old bottles. Either make everything new or give over all patching, as we have done, else all labor is useless." (XVII, 667.) The sense in which Luther's words apply is this: the statistics and description of the various Lutheran churches are *neutralia* with respect to the object aimed at, the promotion of Lutheran unity and solidarity; the removal of the doctrinal differences should have been the chief concern. It will never do to give the bare statement of the individual Church that it subscribes to the confessions of the Lutheran Church. The situation demands that the existing differences be honestly discussed, in the upright Lutheran way. The World Convention itself shirked this duty. It preferred to deal with *neutralia*. Resolution IV

declares: "Since the Lutheran World Convention regards the present unity of faith and confession as the only right ground for the fellowship of the different Lutheran churches and since it regards the living testimony concerning this common faith as the most important and, in fact, the only active means to further the consciousness of this unity, it is recommended that the Executive Committee adopt measures through which the different church-bodies may more intimately learn of the faith, life, and conditions of other Lutheran bodies, that personal testimony may be employed for common instruction and admonition. As such measures have been mentioned: exchange of visits of leaders in the respective churches, an organized activity for information through the Lutheran Press Bureau and through literature, as well as support for Lutheran theological students of minority churches for further theological studies in other Lutheran centers." All of which would be fine, provided the unity of faith first were established; otherwise it is dealing with *neutralia*. And they will continue on this way despite "the common instruction and admonition" advocated as long as they persuade themselves that "the unity of faith is present." Certainly the Lutheran Church possesses, as had been pointed out, a strong bond of unity in the Catechism and in the Augsburg Confession, but why blink the fact that this bond does not unite all? Common instruction and admonition is needed regarding, for instance, the inspiration of Scripture and the *sola gratia*. In which session were these matters discussed? Good testimony was given on these points, as far as it went, but why were not the contraveners called to account? How could the sessions close with the declaration on "the present unity in faith"? Dr. Reu's declaration was heard: "In the Small Catechism and in the faith there expressed we are united. Are we united indeed?" What action was taken on this? Dr. Melhorn reports: "It was this conspicuous absence of any startling differences of conviction that made these sessions bare of intensely dramatic periods." In the judgment of *Schrift und Bekenntnis* "the clearest testimony given was that by Dr. Hein, president of the Ohio Synod. He was outspoken in confessing the verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture and the 'by grace alone'; the mystery, too, of the *discretio personarum* was recognized and both the Calvinistic and the synergistic 'solution' of the mystery downrightly rejected." The anti-inspiration men and gross synergists there present did not take issue with him. The difference of conviction was there, but its manifestation was conspicuously absent. It caused some "uneasiness," says the *Ev.-Luth. Zeitblatt*, but "why should somebody not also speak for the verbal inspiration, seeing that others uttered convictions which manifestly spring from the new Lutheran spirit?" The World Convention was willing to tolerate such views as Dr. Hein and others expressed as innocuous, thus relegating these fundamental articles to the domain of the *neutralia*, matters of indifference. Dr. Elert had a fine subject: "The Faith and Confessions of the Church in the Light of the Marburg Colloquy and the Diet at Augsburg." If his address is correctly reported, it was beside the mark. Dr. Melhorn reports in the *Lutheran*: "It was

at Marburg in 1529 that an effort was made to unite the Lutheran and Swiss reformation leaders. It was there that Luther traced on the table top: 'You have a spirit other than ours.' The lesion between the German leaders and the Zwingli group was not healed by the Marburg Colloquy, and with the advent of Calvin at Geneva two quite different systems of theology and church government were developed, producing what we now call the Lutheran and Reformed divisions among the evangelical Christians. . . . It was expected, we repeat, that Dr. Elert would discuss the distinctions between the Reformed and the Lutherans as seen at Marburg and between the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans as they appeared at Augsburg." (And we should have expected, we add, that he would have admonished the World Convention to follow Luther's example and refuse to fellowship errorists of any kind. However, he preferred to occupy himself with *neutralia*, as the report shows:) "It was therefore a surprise, a pleasant one also, when his paper took the form of indicating how the personal religious experiences of one man or of a small group of men can become the type and standard for many. . . . His address was one of the great ones delivered." — One cannot help contrasting Luther's attitude at Marburg with that incident at Copenhagen when at the conclusion of an address by Archbishop Soederblom the assembly arose and recited in the various languages represented Luther's explanation of the Second Article. Were they all of one mind when they confessed: "Even as He is risen from the dead"? The archbishop of Abo refused to have Archbishop Soederblom take part in a religious celebration in Finland because of his denial of the bodily resurrection of Christ, and Archbishop Soederblom did not deny that he denies this fundamental. We know how Luther would have dealt with him. Luther would not have fellowshiped him so long as the chief things were not set in order. The Lutheran World Convention and the Reformed World Congress meeting at Boston exchanged greetings. Shall we assume that this was only a polite form? Again, the handbook of the World Convention recognizes churches as Lutheran which are not Lutheran, as *Schrift und Bekenntnis* points out. For instance, the Evangelical Church of Thuringia even disclaims the Lutheran name. The subscription of the clergy of the Church of Hamburg to the Book of Concord is not supposed to be of binding force. See page 137 of the handbook itself. And the conditions in this Church are notorious. Yet they speak of "the present unity of faith." All of which goes beyond the bounds of mere *neutralia* and becomes downright unionism. . . . The *Lutheran Church Herald* cannot refrain from saying: "It is to be regretted that the Synodical Conference is not represented at the free World Conference in Copenhagen. — Are the Lutherans meeting at Copenhagen unworthy and unfit to meet with even in a free conference?" If the next World Conference is ready to discuss the weighty matters separating the Lutheran bodies and to refrain meanwhile from unionistic demonstrations, its invitation will meet with a ready response on the part of the Synodical Conference. As to the *Herald's* question — why waste time on *neutralia*? E.

The Danger of Syncretism.—In his address at Copenhagen, Dr. Knubel pointed out the danger of syncretism, secularism, and the social gospel. In a striking way he described these three threatening factors, saying: "Syncretism says, 'All religions are true'; secularism says, 'All religions are false,' and also says, 'The State must be lord over the Church'; the social gospel says, 'The Church must be lord over the State.'" The syncretism Dr. Knubel had in mind may be described as an attempt to accomplish a synthesis of the Christian religion with Mohammedanism, Judaism, Confucianism, etc. No doubt such an amalgamation, constituting a union of Christ and Belial, is being sought to-day in many quarters, and a warning against this tendency is altogether justified. But we must not forget that there would hardly be any syncretism of this nature if there were not a similar attempt to weld the creeds of the various Christian denominations into one more or less composite whole—a sort of crazy-quilt, under which all that bear the Christian name can betake themselves for cover. Calixtus, who is often spoken of as the "Father of Syncretism," did not think of forming a common platform with Mohammedans and Jews; he was concerned with erecting a fold that would shelter Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists. The tendency toward syncretism first manifests itself in indifference toward the distinctive doctrines separating Christian denominations; having developed here, it becomes ambitious and wants to take in all religions. *Initiis obsta.* A.

The Value of Catechetical Instruction.—The following, taken from an editorial in the *Presbyterian*, makes interesting reading:—

"A Roman Catholic priest in Chicago who has been unusually successful in gaining Protestants for the Catholic Church has been frank to state that those whom he had won into the Roman fold were nearly always from the uninstructed. They were not so irreligious as unreligious. They had never known why they were Protestants, and so were easily convinced as to why they should become Catholics. Can we not return to the ancient custom of teaching the Catechism in the Sabbath-school as well as in a few communicants' classes? All who are familiar with the brief and very defective instruction imparted by too many Sabbath-school teachers know that it is quite imperative that other and more vital information be imparted, something to arouse both mind and heart." A.

The Right and the Wrong Kind of Tolerance.—In a sermon which Dr. Machen last spring preached in the chapel of Princeton Theological Seminary, he very correctly and forcibly drew the distinction between right and wrong tolerance. The word is heard so frequently that it behooves us to be informed on the two kinds of tolerance. Dr. Machen's remarks will be read with interest and profit.

"A man may believe what he pleases, provided he does not believe anything strongly enough to risk his life on it and fight for it. 'Tolerance' is the great word. Men even ask for tolerance when they look to God in prayer. But how can any Christian possibly pray such a prayer as that? What a terrible prayer it is, how full of disloyalty to the Lord Jesus Christ! There is a sense, of course, in which tolerance is a virtue. If by it you mean tolerance on the

part of the state, the forbearance of majorities toward minorities, the resolute rejection of any measures of physical compulsion in propagating either what is true or what is false, then, of course, the Christian ought to favor tolerance with all his might and main and ought to lament the wide-spread growth of intolerance in America to-day. Or if you mean by tolerance, forbearance toward personal attacks upon yourself, or courtesy and patience and fairness in dealing with all errors of whatever kind, then again tolerance is a virtue. But to pray for tolerance apart from such qualifications, in particular to pray for tolerance without careful definition of that of which you are to be tolerant, is just to pray for the breakdown of the Christian religion; for the Christian religion is intolerant to the core. There lies the whole offense of the Cross—and also the whole power of it. Always the Gospel would have been received with favor by the world if it had been presented merely as one way of salvation; the offense came because it was presented as the only way and because it made relentless war upon all other ways. God save us, then, from this ‘tolerance’ of which we hear so much; God deliver us from the sin of making common cause with those who deny or ignore the blessed Gospel of Jesus Christ! God save us from the deadly guilt of consenting to the presence as our representatives in the Church of those who lead Christ’s little ones astray; God make us, whatever else we are, just faithful messengers, who present, without fear or favor, not our word, but the Word of God!”

A Baptist on the Sola Gratia and the Gratia Universalis.—We found a remarkable article in the *Watchman-Examiner* of this year. In reprinting it here, we shall, for good and sufficient reasons, omit portions of it and call attention to several unscriptural expressions. But in the main it is charged with sound theology. When we find similar statements in our publications, we take that as a matter of course. Finding them in a Baptist paper we take notice.

“God’s Long Purpose. (Rom. 8, 28. 29.) By Rev. William G. Coltman.—There are but two religions in the world. The one declares that salvation is of man; the other that ‘salvation is of the Lord.’ The one postulates the freedom of the human will, the other the freedom of the divine will. The one springs out of the earth, the other descends out of heaven. One is born in the heart and mind of man, the other in the heart and mind of God. One is natural, the other supernatural. One says, ‘Work out your own salvation’ [not quoting, of course, Phil. 2, 12], the other sings, ‘Jesus paid it all.’ The one puts the responsibility for redemption [meaning conversion and salvation] in the hands of man; the other places the responsibility with God.

“The Bible knows but one religion. Its great affirmation is: ‘Salvation is of the Lord.’ It represents true religion [?] as being conceived in the mind of God, provided by the Son of God, communicated by the Spirit of God, and finally perfected by the Lord Himself. Redemption [meaning salvation] has its origination, continuation, and consummation in God. This is its sublime declaration, and it is in harmony with the teaching of Scripture as a whole. . . .

"The second word is 'foreordained.' . . . The will of God enters, and God determines to rescue those whom He foreknew. [The author did not quite grasp the meaning of *foreknew*.] In other words, He predetermined that they should be His. Foreordination has therefore been defined as 'that active exercise of the will of God by which certain results are brought to pass.' In the realm of redemption God not only foresaw, but He foreordained. There are many confirmations of this. In Acts 2, 23 it is stated that the crucifixion of our Lord was predetermined in the counsel of God. According to 1 Cor. 2, 7 [?] we see that it was God's eternal plan to give us the written Word. But still more wonderful is the fact that in His eternal purpose He should determine to call, to justify, and to glorify such an one as I. 'Oh, the depths of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God!' If I were to ask you the question, 'How did you become a Christian?' you would probably reply, 'Because I chose Christ.' But let me say with strong emphasis that you are not a Christian to-day because you chose Christ, but because Christ chose you, and chose you 'before the foundation of the world.' John 15, 16. In John 6, 44 Christ made a startling statement to His critics, 'No man can come to Me except the Father that sent Me draw him.' When Simon Peter made his great confession at Caesarea Philippi, the Master said, 'Blessed art thou, Simon, Bar-Jonah; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father who is in heaven.' Flesh and blood alone [why the "alone"?] can never bring men and women into an experience [?] of Christ's Saviorhood. This is the result of the divine work on the heart." In discussing foreordination, account must be taken of Eph. 1, 4: "According as He hath chosen us *in Him*." — But mark the following:—

"Right here some one will say, 'Do you mean to affirm that God foreordains some to destruction?' My answer is that such is not the teaching of the text nor of any other portion of Scripture. Foreordination or predestination, according to the Word, has to do only with the redeemed." Redeemed again means those who are converted and finally saved. And now mark well the following:—

"God's attitude towards the world is clear from such passages as John 3, 16; 1 John 2, 1; 2 Pet. 3, 9. Here are two great truths running through the Bible — one that Christ died for the whole world and is 'not willing that any should perish,' and the other that 'whom He foreknew, them He did foreordain to be conformed to the image of His Son.' God has not seen fit to harmonize these two facts. And what He has thought best to leave unrevealed, it is wise for us to let rest. Godly William Jay once said: 'Two grand truths have always seemed to me to pervade the whole Bible and not to be confined to a few phrases, namely, that, if we are saved, it is entirely of God's grace and, if we are lost, it will be entirely from ourselves.'

"'Them He also called.' This is the first act of God in time. We are no longer dealing with the past, but with the present. We have come out of the eternities into the years. Foreknowledge and foreordination took place outside my experience. But now something happens that affects me. His call marks the beginning of the realiza-

tion of His eternal choice. God calls men to Himself — He calls them through His Word and by His Spirit. [We say: by His Spirit through the Word.] And that call carries with it the power of response. It has been referred to as ‘the effectual call.’” [We think the author is using this term without the Calvinistic implication.] God called Abraham while in Ur of the Chaldees, and Abraham went out not knowing whither he went. Saul of Tarsus, breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the servants of the Lord, heard the call on the highway, and soon he is found in the synagogs preaching Christ. The history of true and divine religion in the earth is the history of God’s call to human hearts and their response to His approach. Apart from the divine call, none would be saved. It is only because God took the initiative and called us that we stand before Him justified at this moment.

“‘Whom He called, them He also justified.’ Note carefully that the justification spoken of in the text is a divine matter. And there is no mistaking the context, ‘it is God that justifieth.’ It is because Christ ‘was made sin for us’ that we are ‘made the righteousness of God in Him.’ This glorious Gospel of ours reveals the provision of a righteousness of God for unrighteous men. Justification is therefore an act of God and not an achievement of man. ‘It is God that justifieth.’

“‘Whom He justified, them He also glorified.’ Now we step back out of time into the eternities again. We discover that glorification is as much God’s purpose as justification and that the same will that has determined our salvation has also determined our glorification. The justified are the glorified. The tense dealing with glorification is remarkable, being the same as that dealing with justification. . . . In fact, our glorification is an accomplished thing in the mind and purpose of God. . . . ‘Foreknown, foreordained, called, justified, glorified,’ and all these are ours in Christ Jesus. Not a link in this golden chain will be broken.”

That is certainly taking Scripture at its face value — and thus being enriched in the saving knowledge. We wonder how the Rev. Coltman took the editorial appearing in the same number which carried his article. This editorial says: “As our Lord instituted it, the Lord’s Supper was a simple memorial of His death, the bread standing for His broken body and the wine standing for His shed blood. Its blessing lies in its holy suggestiveness. It is not a work of merit. It is not even a means of grace unless the consciousness of the cost of our salvation moves us to a profounder appreciation of it and to a deeper consecration because of it.” One would think that a man who takes Rom. 8, 28, 29 as the words read, despite the protest of reason, would refuse to have the words of the institution discounted on account of the protest of reason and thus lose the wealth the doctrine of the means of grace bears. It would be well if he and the editor applied the same principle that dictated the article to the editorial.

E.

Drifting to Sanity and Common Sense. — The *Sunday-school Times* reports the following interesting bit of news: “The Christian Science Parent Church departs from the ‘Mother Church,’ ‘in en-

deavoring to bring a new spirit of sanity and common sense into the practise of mental healing. It recognizes the unselfish humanitarian labors of the medical profession in alleviating human suffering.' In this position it supports itself on the alleged authority of Mrs. Eddy, 'in whose personal experience there came a time when neither her own nor her followers' unaided faith was sufficient to relieve her of serious suffering. On various occasions she gratefully availed herself of the services of reputable physicians. She also authorized a practitioner, when he had a patient whom he did not heal, *to consult with an M. D. in the anatomy involved.*'

"This is indeed a new note. The editors of the *Christian Science Watchman*, organ of the Parent Church (from which we make these quotations), describe the standpatters of the 'Mother Church' as a vast army of practitioners almost all of whom are dependent for their livelihood upon their practise. Unless they are loyal to the policies of the board of directors in Boston and renounce medical cooperation, they cannot be officially advertised as authorized practitioners. Disloyalty to the board of directors is punishable by excommunication. Those suspected are out for financial and social disaster. Hence the fervent appeals frequently heard at testimony meetings for support of the Boston directors. . . .

"The five directors are described as a self-perpetuating body, controlling millions of dollars of trust funds and many other millions of income-bearing property. There is an enormous increase of mortality within the organization, according to this report. The public seldom hears of the patient to whom after months of suffering a doctor is hurriedly called in order that there may be no legal complications in securing a death certificate. The facts in such cases are usually suppressed through the elaborate system of espionage and press supervision maintained to protect the 'Mother Church.'

"Under the caption of 'A Ghastly Record' an account is given of the 'appalling death record of the Christian Science Sanatorium in Brookline, Mass., and how this has been covered up by recording the deaths, not from the institution, but from the street number of the institution. This gives the impression that a death at that institution has been a very rare event. The contrary is true.'

"Literature on the subject can be obtained gratis by application to 20 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C." MUELLER.

Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

Dr. H. Ernst, for many years theological professor at the seminary of the Ohio Synod in St. Paul, Minn., died on August 9, eighty-seven years old. He was a graduate of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, and at first a pastor in the Missouri Synod, but withdrew when the controversy on election arose.

Prof. Emmanuel Hirsch of the University of Goettingen and Prof. Hans Rueckert of the University of Leipzig have arranged to publish for the first time a lecture of Luther on the Epistle to the Hebrews. This lecture in manuscript form has been known to research workers for about a generation, while it was held in the possession of the Vatican. It is said to be one of the most important documents throwing light upon Luther's development in the decisive years of 1517 and 1518. — *Luth. Ch. Her.*

In Marburg the celebrated debate between Luther and Zwingli will be commemorated this fall with special festivities. The intention, to judge by the invitation, is not to convince the world that Luther's position was right, but to show how much the Lutheran and the Reformed churches have in common. It will be a case of shouting peace when there is no peace.

In Tuebingen, where F. C. Baur did his faith-destroying work, the old radical Liberalism is gasping for air and to-day can boast but few adherents. We are informed that only ten students still subscribe to it. It is largely Karl Barth's theology, fanciful and unscriptural as it is in a number of points, which is the avalanche crushing the proud structure of the Tuebingen masters. How little terror-stricken souls can find shelter in these man-made hovels is now becoming evident even on the spot where they were first erected.

Writing in the *Pastoralblaetter*, Dr. Erich Stange, the editor, thinks that the present ecumenical movement, endeavoring to bring about cooperation between all the churches, has probably arrived at the crossroads, and that particular dangers threatening it are, in his opinion, the ill-considered rapidity with which some leaders have endeavored to push the ball ahead, the confusion resulting from the many diversified aims that are observable in the movement, the lack of big things attempted at the meetings, the overemphasis placed on official pronouncements of religious congresses, and the insufficient recognition of the necessity of having the guidance of the Spirit of God. This diagnosis of Dr. Stange is not entirely incorrect, but it does not point out to the patient where the trouble chiefly lies, namely, in the rejection of the *sola gratia* and the *sola Scriptura* by at least the great majority of the propagandists of this movement.

When G. K. Chesterton leaves theology alone and discusses philosophy or literature, he often says things that are worth while. The *Literary Digest* reports him as quoting this ancient definition of metaphysics: "It is seeking in a dark room for a black hat that is not there," which is not far from the truth concerning much that is labeled philosophy.

Dr. Samuel M. Zwemer, a world-figure in missionary matters, has been called to be Professor of Missions at Princeton Seminary. From 1891 to 1905 Dr. Zwemer served as missionary in Arabia. He is considered a great authority in everything pertaining to Moslem missions.

Soviet writers are advocating abolition of the venerable week of seven days as it has existed since the creation of the world, and the introduction of a week of six days, five work-days and one day of rest. It reminds one of the French revolutionists, who likewise tried to do away with the Sunday and with church festivals. At this writing the daily press carries the news item that the Soviet government, on September 5, abolished Sunday as a regular day of rest.

In the *Hibbert Journal*, attention is drawn to an utterance of T. H. Huxley, which is interesting as setting forth the view at which an unbelieving scientist who closely observes events has to arrive. Huxley, we are told, was "driven to the statement that that which is ethically best involves a course of conduct which in all respects is opposed to that which leads to success in the cosmic struggle for existence." It was the logic of facts as known to him which dictated to Huxley this remarkable statement: "The good man must lose in the struggle for existence." This is sounding the very depths of pessimism. Compare with that the triumphant statement of the believer that "all things work together for good to them that love God," and that those whom God has justified He has also glorified.

Utah has 544 Mormon churches, with an aggregate membership of 327,000; Idaho, 270, with 85,000 members; Arizona, 58 churches; California, 48; Wyoming, 45; Colorado, 24; Nevada, 22; Montana, 21.—*Watchman-Examiner*.

BOOK REVIEW.

Luther's Large Catechism. By *John Theodore Mueller, Ph. D., Th. D.*
195 pages, 5¼×7½. \$1.35. Order from Concordia Publishing House,
St. Louis, Mo.

We are this year celebrating the four-hundredth anniversary of the writing of Luther's two Catechisms. Most attention is given to Luther's Small Catechism and very little to Luther's Large Catechism. The Large Catechism, however, is a book that is worth while, not only for the pastor and the teacher, but also for the layman, and we ought therefore not to fail to call attention to the fact that Dr. Mueller has prepared a separate edition with chapter-heads. Dr. Kretzmann, who wrote the foreword, says: "The fact that the text has been offered in convenient paragraph form, with headings, which serve as guides to the understanding of the text, will be welcomed by all those who will make use of this wonderful material for private study, for devotional use, and for wider doctrinal instruction."

J. H. C. F.

Is the Bible Reliable? Vital Questions Answered by Scientists, Christian Believers, and the Bible. By *Bjug A. Harstad*, Parkland, Wash.
Bound, \$1; in paper cover, 75 cts. Order from Rev. Adolph Harstad,
Thornton, Iowa.

If you have never met the author, whose picture, by the way, is used as frontispiece, you will, by perusing this book, learn what kind of man he is — a sturdy, whole-souled pioneer pastor and missionary, unalterably opposed to compromise in the sphere of revealed truth, well indoctrinated in the teachings of the Bible and the Lutheran Church, and not afraid of measuring swords with any enemies of the Savior. You would be inclined to guess that he studied theology under Dr. Walther, and this guess would turn out correct. In the book before us, as the title indicates, Pastor Harstad is defending the Holy Scriptures against attacks made on it by infidels and unbelievers. After having, in Part 1, brought evidence from the outside that the reliability and divineness of the Bible must not be questioned, he sets forth in Part 2 what the holy Book itself has to say on its origin and defends especially the doctrine of verbal inspiration. Part 3 discusses difficulties which people have found in the Scriptures, apparent contradictions, and the like, and the author shows that they are without foundation. Part 4 contains information taken from prominent authorities on some of the so-called "holy books" of the Orient and the religious systems based on them. Finally various appendices are added, giving information on the chronology of the Bible, Hebrew times and festivals, Jewish money, Roman money, and the approximate height of sacred localities. A welcome array of reproductions of photographs acquainting the reader with most of the fellow-ministers of the author in the Norwegian Synod concludes the book. We can but be thankful for the firmness with which our venerable brother confesses the truth and wish for his book a wide circle of readers. Here and there we cannot agree with his exegesis, but that does not keep us one minute from giving his book our hearty endorsement.

A.

The Sumerians. A Civilization in 3500 B.C. By *C. Leonard Woolley*. 98 pages. 29 illustrations. \$2.00. (Oxford University Press, New York.)

For the last eight years C. Leonard Woolley, as leader of the joint expedition of the University of Pennsylvania Museum and the British Museum, has directed important excavations on the site of Ur, the famous city of the Chaldees, long buried in the desert sand of Mesopotamia. His studies in the field of archeology and his practical experiences in the country concerning whose ancient inhabitants he writes in this volume has enabled him to supply a book which represents the latest word on the history and culture of the ancient Sumerians, and which is of absorbing interest not only to students of archeology and anthropology, but also to those of the Holy Bible, the truths of which also the excavations of these recent expeditions confirm. Of course, much of what the author says with regard to the early history of the peoples inhabiting the Mesopotamian Valley is, and will perhaps remain, conjecture. Whence these immigrants came, at what time they settled in the various districts, and who they were, all these are questions which the archeologist cannot as yet answer with certainty. Nevertheless, so much information has been gained by the recent excavations that to-day we have quite an adequate conception of their culture and their cultural achievements. These form the most important chapters of Dr. Woolley's book, which proves quite conclusively that not Egypt, but Sumer, was the forerunner of the Old World civilizations — Egypt, Assyria, Asia Minor, Crete, and Greece. The book is intended primarily for students, but it is never too technical for the average intelligent reader. There are in all seven chapters, five of which concern themselves with historical matters. The two others treat "Sumerian Society" and the "Claim of Sumer," and in these the author is at his best, since he is here dealing with facts, well substantiated by proofs. However, the whole monograph is an excellent contribution to archeological literature, and that in a field which has scarcely been touched. Professor Woolley is recognized as one of the world's foremost archeologists, and also this volume testifies to his painstaking research, his careful discrimination, and his sound judgment. It is a standard work, and students interested in Sumerian civilization cannot afford to neglect studying the first-hand information which the learned author has so well condensed into a few pages.

MUELLER.

The World's Miracle and Other Observations. By *Karl Reiland*, Rector of St. George's Church, New York. \$1.75. (Henry Holt & Co., New York.)

This review may serve as a side-light on conditions in the Episcopal Church. The foreword, by Robert Norwood, rector of St. Bartholomew's Church, New York, declares: "Reiland lifts a trumpet to his lips, and every word is a ringing blast for the beauty of holiness. . . . This book is the distillation of a great preacher's heart." The book presents Modernism of an extreme type, the Modernism of the old rationalism modernized by evolutionism. It has no room for the saving doctrine, for faith in Jesus Christ, but teaches salvation through morality. "I have before me an official publication in which I read 'the Apostles' Creed is a sufficient

statement of the Christian faith.' Now, that is exactly what the creed is not. There is not a word in any creed, or all of them together, of the ethical and spiritual teaching of Jesus; not a suggestion of the biggest theme of the Gospel—*love of God and our fellow-men*; not a word about sacrifice, unselfishness, and service; nothing but a cold, formal statement, entirely inadequate as a statement of the 'Christian faith,' which is infinitely larger and better." The discussion of moral questions is clothed in beautiful language and, taken by itself, frequently goes to the heart of the matter. Take, for instance, the "swimming ax." "With this poor workman on the banks of the Jordan there is real embarrassment, rare in borrowers; there is sharp despair, scarce in borrowers; there is the consciousness of deep regret, unusual in borrowers." But in every case it fails to reach the real heart of the matter, denying as it does the faith in the work of Jesus. "Must I believe the creeds literally, or the miracles, or the literal historical miracle of the Virgin Birth, or that Jesus is God—in order to be a devout Christian?" I answer in the only way—in my judgment—it should be answered, with an emphatic 'No.'" And so he cannot get beyond the shallow moralizing of the old rationalists. Nor does he blush to take over the shallow subterfuges of his fathers. This is his brilliant explanation of the miracle of the swimming ax: "I am ready to believe that Elisha was clever enough to poke around with a stick until he happened to catch the eye of the head and brought it thus to the surface." There is, of course, the usual, or rather an unusual, amount of disparagement of Church, orthodoxy, and creed. Just one more quotation: "It is a satisfaction to me that there was a 'doubting Thomas.' Let him be the patron saint of all those who want the evidence of their senses and the faculty of reason to accompany their beliefs as far as possible in every experience." And this is the man a section of the Episcopal Church has constituted its leader. Says the rector of St. Bartholomew's: "America of the churches has no figure more commanding than the author of these prose sonnets which it is my privilege to commend. This book is the distillation of a great preacher's heart."—There are Episcopalians who are disgusted with the book. To the reviewer of *The Living Church*, October 5, 1929, "it sounded like a composite of Pollyanna, Dr. Fosdick, and Clarence Darrow."

E.

The Faith that Wins. By Roy Talmage Brumbaugh. 125 pages. 75 cts.
(The Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago.)

This is a brief and popular commentary on Heb. 11, 1—12, 2. It is well written and, in the main, sound. In a passing way, however, the book teaches the Reformed doctrine of the Sacraments and also the false doctrine of the millennium.

J. H. C. F.

Concordia Christmas Greeting Cards. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

These Christmas-cards are to be sold by our schools, the purchase price being 15 cents per set of ten cards and the selling price 25 cents. The pictures illustrate the early days of our Savior's life and are accompanied by little verses written by Prof. W. G. Polack. Envelopes are furnished with the cards, which, accordingly, are not post-cards. The cards are put up only in boxes of 25 packages.

A.

CHOIRMASTERS: Prepare for Christmas!

"Extremely pleasing and satisfying." — *Theol. Monthly*.

"A proper interpretation of these gems will convince even the most fastidious that nothing can surpass their majestic simplicity."
— *Homiletic Magazine*.

"We heartily urge choirmasters to become acquainted with this collection." — *Lutheran School Journal*.

The Contents: —

All Glory Be to God on High.*
All Praise to Jesus' Hallowed Name.*
All My Heart This Night Rejoices.
Orueger.
All My Heart This Night Rejoices.
Orueger. (Arranged.)
Angels from the Realms of Glory. Smart.
As with Gladness Men of Old. Kocher.
(Arranged.)
Behold a Branch is Growing. Praetorius.
From Heav'n Above.*
From Heav'n Above. Gumpeltzheimer.
Gloria. French Carol.
God Rest You, Merry Gentlemen. Trad.
English.
Hail to the Lord's Anointed.*
Hark! the Herald Angels Sing. Mendelssohn. (Arranged.)
How Bright Appears the Morning Star.*
It Came Upon the Midnight Clear. Willis.
Joy to the World! Handel.
Let All Together Praise Our God.*
Now Raise Your Happy Voice. Praetorius.
Now Raise Your Happy Voice.*
Now Raise Your Happy Voice. Old
choral, arranged.
O'er Judea's Starlit Plain. Wismar.
O Come, All Ye Faithful! Harmonized
by Reading.
O Little Town of Bethlehem. Barnby.
O Little Town of Bethlehem. Redner.
Once He Came in Blessing.*
O What Happiness! Arranged by Becker.
Praise God the Lord.*
Praise to the Lord. Old choral.
Shepherds, Ho, Awake! Ancient melody.
Shepherds, Shake Off Your Drowsy Sleep.
Besançon carol.
Silent Night. Gruber.
Silent Night. Arranged by Becker.
The First Noel. Trad. air.
To Shepherds as They Watched by Night.*
Wake, Awake!*
Wake, Awake! Praetorius.
We Three Kings of Orient Are. Hopkins.
What Child Is This? Old English.
While Shepherds Watched Their Flocks.
Handel.
While Shepherds Watched Their Flocks.
Old English melody.
While Shepherds Watched Their Flocks.
Willis.

* Harmonized by Bach.

This popular collection of
42 carols and chorals for
mixed voices will be
helpful to you

SOUNDING JOY

By WALTER WISMAR



The Diapason says: —

"Many of the old favorite carols are to be found here, and much valuable material also, not so well known, but highly deserving of wider use. Mr. Wismar has sensibly been content to state the musical message in the simplest possible way; his good taste and efficient musicianship are made evident, but not at the cost of any mutilation or personal mannerisms. What the volume offers is a golden collection of sterling heart-melodies, of wide practical value, sure to please all auditors and to be grateful to the singers."

48 pages, 6×9, green paper covers, red angel design. Single copies, @ 35 cts.
dozen copies, \$3.36, and postage

Consult our Music Catalog for other
appropriate Christmas music

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE

3558 South Jefferson Ave.
Saint Louis, Missouri

Niemand wird es ohne inneren Gewinn lesen!

(Dr. Fuerbringer im "Lutheraner".)

"Der Verfasser hat dieses Buch seiner geliebten Mutter gewidmet, die ihren Kindern ein herrliches Vorbild des schlichten und selbstlosen Haushalterlebens gegeben hat, ohne dass sie sich dessen bewusst war. Wo Christen stets dessen eingedenk sind, dass sie Gottes Haushalter sind, und danach sich auch verhalten, wird es recht und wohl um sie und das Reich Gottes stehen, dem sie angehören. Man kann nur wuenschen, dass dieses kleine, aber so inhaltreiche, lehrreiche und anregende Buechlein viele Abnehmer findet, die es genau studieren." — *Kinder- und Jugendblatt*.

"Zwar sind die Ausfuehrungen des Verfassers schon an sich reichhaltig, doch geben sie ausserdem noch manche Veranlassung zu weiterem Nachdenken. Die Erzehlungen, mit denen jedes Kapitel eingeleitet wird, sind vortrefflich. . . . Auch der Pastor kann Nutzen fuer seine Predigten aus diesem Buechlein ziehen. Uns hat Kapitel zweielf — 'Stewardship and Youth' — ganz besonders gefallen. Moege Gottes Segen dies Buch begleiten!" — *Missionstaube*.

"This is one of the most interesting books on stewardship that I have read for some time. . . . All of the chapters are very interesting. The author begins each chapter with a splendid illustration. These stories alone are worth the price of the book. I can commend this book very heartily to our readers." — *Missouri Baptist Bulletin*.

"May Pastor Kretzschmar's book find a place in the homes and the hearts of our people!" — *Theological Monthly*.

"A true understanding of Christian stewardship such as this book aims to further would solve many problems which to-day confront our Church." — *Lutheran School Journal*.

"Here the preacher may learn and gather material. It is an excellent little volume, full of instruction and stimulation. Let us have our people read and heed its appeal." — *Lutheran Witness*.

"This is a timely publication." — *S. S. Teachers' Quarterly*.

THE STEWARDSHIP LIFE

By REV. KARL KRETZSCHMAR

(Fort Smith, Ark.)

208 pages, pocket size, 4¼ × 5¾ in.

Green silk cloth binding, gilt stamping

List price, \$1.00 the copy

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE

3558 S. Jefferson Ave., Saint Louis, Missouri